

REMARKS

The Applicant has received and reviewed the Final Official Action dated 21 December 2005 (hereinafter, the “Final Action”). This paper is submitted as a fully-responsive reply to the Final Action, and the Applicant requests favorable action on the subject application at the earliest convenience of the Office. This response is submitted with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

As stated in Paragraph 2 on Page 2 of the Final Action, claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,329,578 to Brennan, et al. (hereinafter, “Brennan”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,563,939 to La Porta, et al. (hereinafter, “La Porta”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,157 to Clarke, et al. (hereinafter, “Clarke”). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Turning first to **independent claim 1**, without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection and solely to advance the prosecution of this application, the Applicant has revised claim 1 to clarify further features of the method. For convenience, the Applicant reproduces here the revisions to claim 1:

“overriding the outgoing call blocking service for at least a second single outgoing communication from the calling line by entering an override code.”

The Applicant submits that the revisions to claim 1 are fully supported under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, by the originally-filed specification, at least by page 2, line 30 – page 3, line 2.

Turning to the cited art, the Applicant agrees with the assessment on Page 3 of the Final Action that neither Brennan nor LaPorta disclose activating the outgoing call blocking service at a first pre-set time and de-activating the outgoing call blocking service at a second pre-set time. Accordingly, the Action cited Clarke for this teaching.

Without conceding that Clarke provides the teaching for which it is cited, the Applicant respectfully submits that Clarke fails to teach or suggest at least the features reproduced above as recited in claim 1. More specifically, Clarke neither teaches nor suggests “overriding the outgoing call blocking service for at least a second single outgoing communication from the calling line by entering an override code”.

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Brennan, La Porta, and Clarke do not support a § 103 rejection of claim 1, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and stand rejected on similar grounds. Accordingly, the above comments directed to claim 1 apply equally to claims 2-10. The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 2-10.

Turning now to **independent claim 11**, without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection and solely to advance the prosecution of this application, the Applicant has revised claim 11 to clarify further features of the method.

For convenience of discussion, the Applicant reproduces here the revisions to claim 11:

“enabling the subscriber to prohibit outgoing long-distance calls from being placed from the calling line;

enabling the subscriber to prohibit outgoing calls to at least one specified area code;
enabling the subscriber to prohibit outgoing calls to at least one specified telephone number;
enabling the subscriber to prohibit special feature calls from being placed from the calling line;
enabling the subscriber to allow outgoing calls only to at least one specified local telephone number; and
enabling the subscriber to allow outgoing calls only to at least one specified telephone number.”

The revisions made to claim 11 are believed fully supported under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, at least at page 12, line 25 through page 15, line 29.

Turning to the cited art, the comments directed above regarding Brennan and La Porta apply equally to claim 11. Regarding Clarke, without conceding that Clarke provides the teaching for which it is cited, the Applicant submits that Clarke neither teaches nor suggests at least the features reproduced above from claim 11.

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Brennan, La Porta, and Clarke do not support a § 103 rejection of claim 11, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 11.

Claims 12-14 depend from claim 11 and stand rejected on similar grounds. Accordingly, the above comments directed to claim 11 apply equally to claims 12-14. The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 12-14.

Turning now to **independent claim 15**, without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and solely to advance the prosecution of this application, the Applicant has cancelled claims 15-21 without waiver, prejudice, or disclaimer.

Turning now to **independent claim 22**, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and solely to advance the prosecution of this application, the Applicant has revised claim 22 to clarify further features of the system. The revisions made to claim 22 are similar to the revisions made to claim 1, but the revisions made to claim 22 pertain more specifically to:

“a services circuit node adapted to enable a subscriber to the outgoing call blocking service to:

prohibit outgoing long-distance calls from being placed from the calling line;

prohibit outgoing calls to at least one specified area code;

prohibit outgoing calls to at least one specified telephone number;

prohibit special feature calls from being placed from the calling line;

allow outgoing calls only to at least one specified local telephone number; and

allow outgoing calls only to at least one specified telephone number.”

The revisions made to claim 22 are believed fully supported under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, on at least the same basis as were the revisions to claim 11 above. More specifically, the services circuit node (SCN) is referenced at 134 in Figure 1.

Turning to the cited art, the comments directed to claim 11 above regarding Brennan, La Porta, and Clarke apply equally to claim 22.

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Brennan, La Porta, and Clarke do not support a § 103 rejection of claim 22, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 22.

Claims 23-24 depend from claim 22 and stand rejected on similar grounds. Accordingly, the above comments directed to claim 22 apply equally to claims 23-24.


The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 23-24.

Conclusion

The Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections favorable action of claims 1-14 and 22-24. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent favorable action on this case, **the Office is requested to contact the undersigned to resolve the issue.**

Date: 21 MAR 06

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Rocco L. Adornato
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 40,480
(509) 324-9256 ext. 257